

DTH Editorial Page

Opinions of the Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. Letters and columns, covering a wide range of views, reflect the personal opinions of their authors.

A Year In Retrospect: The Daily Tar Heel

First of Three Parts

In just three short days, the Daily Tar Heel will undergo the annual rejuvenation process which allows it to retain eternal youth in the midst of an aging world. A new editor will assume the post which we have shared for the past year, and the accompanying changes in character and policy of the paper will set the pace of things to come during the next twelve months. As our term of office draws to a close, we wish to devote part of our editorial space to an appraisal and summation of the past year.

Fred Seely and
Hugh Stevens

The editorship of *The Daily Tar Heel* is unique among the opportunities which this old but energetic campus offers her sons. The traditional role of the journalist—to test and prove himself in the public eye—is nowhere more real or significant than among the daily pages of this, one of America's oldest and largest college publications.

No one has ever been able to say WHY he wanted to be editor of the Daily Tar Heel. Plenty of people voice daily WHAT they would do if they were editors ("If I was the editor, I'd..."), or even WHERE they think the paper belongs ("They oughta take that piece of trash and throw it...").

But the WHY is inexplicable. Surely no one has ever been editor in order to make himself popular or powerful. Historical tradition, together with the world's most critical readership, assures the editor of volumes of disapproval no matter what kind of job he does.

Further, the editor knows that his academic advancement will be retarded, his social life abrogated, and his recreation virtually eliminated. Still, there is always someone eager to accept the job each year, and the paper thrives and progresses because its blood is continually revitalized. WHY is this so?

A Triumph For The Fine Arts

Last spring, when the first proposals for a biennial series of fine arts festivals to alternate with the Carolina Symposium were advanced, a few members of the University community raised skeptical eyebrows. Perhaps they had reason; perhaps they had seen the abortive efforts of the past flourish briefly, only to fail. Perhaps they felt that even Chapel Hill, cultural oasis that it is, could neither generate nor sustain the intellectual energy required to support such an event.

The skeptics, fortunately, were wrong. The 1965 Fine Arts Festival is now history, and successful history at that. All who played a part in staging such an outstanding event deserve our heartfelt thanks, for it appears likely that they have succeeded in establishing a cultural beachhead which can only grow more formidable with time.

Some changes will occur in future years, and rightly so. Hopefully, the multitude of associated events, such as plays and art exhibits, will increase as special groups take advantage of the large festival audiences.

Certainly, it is not inconceivable that future festivals may adopt themes on which to build an entire week's performance, much like the Symposium. But such refinements will come with experience.

The Daily Tar Heel

72 Years of Editorial Freedom

Second Class postage paid at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester, \$8 per year. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc. The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all local news printed in this newspaper as well as all AP news dispatches.

Perhaps the best answer is the one to which we have responded often this year: "Somebody is going to do it; it might as well be us."

Somebody must be willing to have himself quoted by the state papers when a crisis arises and his editorial comment leaps into the headlines. Somebody must be available to answer to the administration, to defend the student viewpoint, to inform the campus, and to assess the impact of the failures and successes, both major and minor, that mark the pathway of the University.

Somebody must be willing to assume his political stance and then dodge the verbal stones from the right and left. If he thinks of himself as a "moderate," he may fully expect the liberals to say he is stodgy or apathetic or bigoted or, to use their favorite term, "wishy-washy." The conservatives, on the other hand, simply use the word "liberal," since it is the worst expletive those on the right can find. The right-wingers are also apt to associate the press, and especially the student press, with nebulous "conspiracy."

Finally, somebody must be willing to "call 'em as he sees 'em" and ignore the biting condemnations which follow. He must be willing to print the truth even when the truth is not what the public wants to read. He must be willing to stand up for what he believes, to fight hard against those who distort and falsify, and to say "I was mistaken" when there is nothing else to be said.

Somebody must do it. And that somebody, whoever he may be, is a lucky man. For out of the duties that are necessary arise the goals that are possible, the self-evaluation that pushes one toward maturity, and the experience that leads to new knowledge.

Those goals, that maturity, and that knowledge are the things which will remain long after the criticism and the frustration cease to exist. Perhaps they explain WHY somebody will always edit *The Daily Tar Heel*.

Ironically, the one truly sour note struck during the week came from an event that was predicted to be the highlight of the Festival—the Esquire Literary Symposium. The audience was small and the participants obviously were uninspiring. Later, Esquire publisher Arnold Gingrich was heard voicing his displeasure with "Southern students who aren't interested in literature."

Mr. Gingrich's comment is undeserved. Whether Southern students are as interested in literature as their counterparts is difficult to ascertain; but a blanket condemnation certainly cannot be made on the basis of the Esquire Symposium. Frankly, we doubt that more than a few dozen members of the student body had ever heard of the participants, none of whom ranks among America's heavyweight writers.

In the past five years, the Esquire Symposium has presented such figures as Robert Penn Warren, Saul Bellow, James Baldwin, Edward Albee, Dorothy Parker and Norman Mailer at campuses in the north and west. UNC, to put it bluntly, was shortchanged, and if Mr. Gingrich was disappointed, it partially was because he chose to play his hand without a trump card. Further, the effect of carrying the Symposium over a weekend no doubt diminished interest in the festival and injured attendance.

But one small shortcoming cannot and will not cause permanent injury to the entire Festival. Rather, the generally excellent quality of the event and the response from the University community apparently has made it possible to make one final assessment long awaited by those who have labored so long to see this dream come true—the Fine Arts Festival will be back.

'... Vision To See To The End Of The Row'

When the Order of the Golden Fleece extended honorary membership to state Senator Ralph H. Scott of Alamance County at its March 29 taping, it marked the first time that such an honor had gone to anyone who was neither an alumnus or a faculty member of the Chapel Hill campus.

Why was this crusty veteran of the North Carolina political wars singled out for such an honor? Howard White, editor of the *Burlington Daily Times-News*, answers that question in the following article.

— The Editors

The secret leading to last Monday night was well kept. When tapping started for the Order of the Golden Fleece at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, however, there was one who was included whose credentials were different from those in the past. State Sen. Ralph H. Scott of Hawfields had not attended the Chapel Hill institution. Yet, he was made a member of the Order.

What prompted this decision? To help provide an answer, a part of the past must be understood.

He Became Involved

There was much concern expressed by supporters of Sen. Scott during last year's Democratic primary and general election. He possibly had been the closest friend and adviser to his late brother, Gov. Sen. W. Kerr Scott, and he had come to be a strong admirer and confidant of Gov. Terry Sanford, who had handled his brother's senatorial campaign. His political leanings also took him into the camp of L. Richardson Preyer as the nomination battles were being waged.

It would have been easy for the senator to have stayed in his home county and campaigned for his own election, for Republicanism and Goldwaterism were proving to be rather strong political forces at work in Alamance.

But the senator never has been one to choose the easiest and the more conforming methods of politics. He got into the Preyer campaign, worked hard, talked a lot, threw out what was interpreted to be some rather cutting remarks, and stirred up to no small degree the anger of the Moore and Lake forces.

He knew he was placing his own bid for re-election on the line, that Richard Barnwell was a formidable Republican opponent, and that his own supporters were divided in their feelings on his state-wide involvement. But he played the game of politics the only way he knew—by being frank, honest with himself, and courageous.

When the final tally came in on election night, he had won a fifth term as state senator by a scant 200 votes.

"I'm not a gambler," he told one of his supporters during the heat of campaigning, "but I suppose I'm gambling on this one."

Then, in February he returned to Raleigh for another session of the General Assembly, another period in decisions of state government that had found him deeply involved for a long time not only as close friend and confidant of governors but as a veteran and influential senator who had served as a member of the Advisory Budget Commission for four years and as President Pro Tem of the Senate in the 1963 session.

How different would it be for him in Raleigh during the 1965



SEN. RALPH SCOTT

session? He had supported a losing candidate. He had alienated numerous people who had been with both Gov. Moore and Dr. Lake throughout their campaigns. He was to serve under his nephew, Lt. Gov. Robert H. Scott, in the Senate.

Decision Faced

The new lieutenant governor also was facing a decision when the General Assembly convened. He had an uncle who was not in complete favor with the new administration, and his uncle had been a part of some important assignments.

Robert Scott spoke a few times about his feelings. "I know one thing," he said, "I know that I want his experience, for it can and will be valuable to the session."

Where would the new lieutenant governor assign his uncle? The answer wasn't long in

coming. Sen. Scott soon was named by his nephew to be chairman of the important Committee on Higher Education.

Whether the senator had requested the assignment, or whether the lieutenant governor had looked to his uncle as the right one in experience to head the committee and the sensitive issues it was to face, probably will never be known. But it was evident that higher education in North Carolina would be in jeopardy unless there were a veteran senator on the scene to head the committee who had the qualifications that were evident in Sen. Scott.

Consistent Pattern

It is possible that much of Sen. Scott's public service career may have been overlooked because of partisan political involvements. Yet, his work in the Senate, in review, had followed a rather consistent pattern.

He had served as chairman of the Senate Education Committee in a past session.

He had become one of the lieutenants of the Sanford administration in seeing that education did get the emphasis which the governor had pledged in his campaign.

He had become the chief legislative contact in seeing that the program for mentally retarded children got new attention—and new encouragement—as well as new funds. He worked closely with Emil Cortes of Burlington, who had become almost a full-time campaigner for the cause, and the two of them, in turn, were named to the state commission which would direct the new program.

While these personal interests were being carried out, the senator was invited to make a talk before a Raleigh American Legion Post. The speech got state-wide attention, for the senator lashed out at the Speaker-Ban Law, which the General Assembly had passed in its closing hours in the 1963 session. He became one of the first leaders in state political circles to let his objection become a part of public review. This expressed his personal opinion, but it also expressed the opinion of higher education leaders in the state. He has continued to express his opposition to the law, also, though if by no means is the most popular position to take.

Another of the issues in which he became involved was the proposed name change for N. C. State College, of which he is an alumnus. The name was changed by the General Assembly to North Carolina State of the University of North Carolina at Raleigh, and untold numbers of State alumni didn't like the new identification in the slightest. Yet, Sen. Scott stayed by the decision of the General Assembly, claiming that the name wasn't as important as the institution's position in the total consolidated university program. He said that the new name of North Carolina State University could remove the link that had held Chapel Hill, Raleigh and Greensboro together so closely. It wasn't worth taking such a chance, he said. This, too, was a personal opinion, but it also was in accord with the position of officials in the consolidated university.

The pattern, then, is evident. There is no way to fully determine the many hours of behind-the-scenes work the senator has given to education and higher education beyond the public positions he had held, but it

can be assumed to have consumed much of his senatorial and his private time.

Opportunity

It may be proper to identify him more completely in line with opportunity for young people, for this seems to better describe his service than the single category of education. The mentally retarded child is getting a new chance at education, of course, but in the broader sense the way has been opened for more opportunity for him.

And the senator's work in public education and in higher education as it reflects in past years to the present adds to the identification—opportunity for young people.

The Speaker-Ban Law undoubtedly is viewed by him as a clamp on educators and on students alike to learn—and communism is a part of that learning, not as it bids for loyalty but as it enters into the total what communism is and its comparison with other philosophies of government.

Let any issue arise striking at education, at opportunity for young people to find their way into the future, and he has been on the side of education and opportunity.

High Honor

All of this service, these many years in the State Senate and the roles he has played, approached last Monday night in Chapel Hill.

The Order of the Golden Fleece is the university's highest honorary order.

The Order in the past has tapped only university students or faculty members. This was the first time in the long and honored history of the Order that someone from the outside had been chosen.

In tapping Sen. Scott into its membership, this citation was presented:

"Ralph Henderson Scott of Haw River, the senator from Alamance, ever ready to do battle for the cause of education, an outspoken friend of the university, partisan for the cause of the mentally retarded, a public man with a capacity for clarity, a conscience for justice, and the vision to see and to follow to the end of the row."

Battles Subside

Today, political battles of the past largely have subsided.

He commented not long ago that Raleigh in this session has not rejected him. No one seems to hold it against him for the major role he played in opposition to the present administration.

He now has found himself in accord with the Moore program as it came from the budget message and in its aim and purpose. He has been honored on many occasions in the many areas of interest in which his time away from Melville Dairy has taken him. He's a former Citizen of the Year for Alamance, for instance, and the list of offices he has held in public service organizations, as well as those of his church and education and in the dairying industry, is long.

But no honor, in all probability, has been more fitting than that which came through the Order of the Golden Fleece. He long ago dedicated himself to educational progress for the state, and he hasn't changed his course.

Letters To The Editors

'Beardless Youth' (Sipe) Is No Art Judge

Grill Is Choice Over Dry Jubilee

Editors, The Tar Heel:

I certainly hope the Graham Memorial Activities Board enjoys its dry Jubilee in cozy Kenan Stadium. Personally, I think I shall spend that weekend at the Grill; the entertainment is just as good and the management is much more reasonable.

Michael Crowell
206 Manly

Letter Suggests OG Burger Rally

Editors, The Tar Heel:

HARK YE!
Today a sign is made unto you, ye apathetic and insensitive souls, as a challenge to all you sons and daughters of Chapel Hill who love her beauty.

The insidious, malicious plot, well-known to all, of the man Hanna from Charlotte, to place amongst you this offensive edifice in tribute to the American Hamburger, an altar to gastro-

nomie mediocrity and universal heart-burn, will be protested this night if, under the more public and practical leadership of the Daily Tar Heel, students will gather and burn the sign which has been presented.

THE ORDER OF THE GADFLY

Editors' Note: This letter, like all from this order, was submitted secretly, and is printed in the hope that something will actually come of it. If the Order is seriously planting a responsible sign, we, as opponents of the hamburger stand, will support a rally tonight.

Vietnam Policy

Is 'Irrational'

Editors, The Tar Heel:

In reply to Messrs. Kurth and Rueli whose letter of April 3 criticized mainly my presumed aloof and unrealistic abhorrence of the use of gas by the American—advised South Vietnamese forces, I say simply that they either overlooked or misunderstood my main contention,

which the use of gas and the new freedom allowed our bomber pilots on their missions into North Viet Nam symbolized quite aptly and abruptly.

My central argument was that our Viet Nam policy has become an increasingly irrational, desperate and brutal display of armed might discharged by men unsympathetic and perhaps also oblivious to Southeast Asian historical, cultural and political realities.

My critics chose to flail at peripheral points in my argument rather than deal with this, my major proposition: that American in Viet Nam is waging a wild and irrelevant military fight against indigenous political, economic and social forces which cannot, by whatever force of arms, be made to subside.

The folly to which we are drawn by such a fruitless struggle is highlighted by our extraordinary use of nausea gas in a wartime situation. If my critics cannot see the inhumanity of this deed (for this gas can indeed be fatal to those already suffering from heart and

lung ailments), can they at least see the serious consequences it has for America's moral and political position in Asia?

Or, do they think our commitment in Asia is just part of the white man's burden which Asians cannot be expected to understand, their primitive needs and desires therefore being of no particular concern to us—their self-chosen mentors and saviors?

The use of tear gas by the world's police forces and by the British in Cyprus has no significance to the serious military and political Viet Nam situation. To equate the use of tear gas in civilian riot control situations as in Montgomery or Harlem or Cyprus with the use of nausea gas in straight-forward military operations in Viet Nam is tantamount to suggesting that international order is a matter similar to and as enforceable as internal order within a nation. In the light of present world realities this is palpable nonsense.

War is the manifest sign of mutually unacceptable international differences. National po-

lice forces are the symbols of an accepted authority to keep civil peace. Police actions to safeguard civil order are therefore not equable with wartime actions which seek not to reasonably control but only to irrationally obliterate sources of irritation.

Therefore, tear gas may or may not be proper to quell civil disorder according to the community consensus on the issue. In international warfare the issue is larger since involving clashing cultures and hence the sense of common humanity is important.

It has been the sense of mankind that any type of gas warfare is reprehensible and proscribed from practice. It is plain that we have in Viet Nam as did Italy in Abyssinia and Japan in China violated the standards, such as they are, of conventional warfare.

Our war policy consequently is not only irrational and impolitic, it is also unjust and contrary to the international consensus concerning proper war practices.

Phillip Podlich
415 Connor

